

### REMARKS

The Final Office Action, mailed March 20, 2009, considered claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-23 and 25-41. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-23 and 25-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0091226).

By this response, claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11-15, 17, 20-21, 28, 33 and 37 are amended, and claims 2, 16, 18-19, 22-23, 25-27 and 38-41 are cancelled, such that claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11-15, 17, 20-21 and 28-37 remain pending and of which claims 1, 21, and 28 are the only independent claims at issue. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification, including, but not limited to the disclosure found in ¶¶ [0023]-[0029] and ¶¶ [0032]-[0033] and Figures 1, 2 and 4 of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0235012.

The claimed embodiments are generally directed to systems and methods for source code control. Claim 28, for example, recites a method for tracking and reconciling offline file editing and enforcing file security. Claim 18 defines establishing a client workspace. The client workspace stores source code files, allowing a user to checkout and modify the files. A remote source code file is downloaded from a source code control repository, and is stored in the client workspace. The client system is moved to an offline mode. The source code file is checked-out for editing by a user, and a pristine copy is cached in a client file cache, which can be used when in the offline mode to facilitate undo and difference processes involving the one or more commands. The source code file is modified in the client workspace by executing one or more commands against the file. Activity data (including the commands) is stored in an activity list. The client system is moved to an online mode. An error check is performed to determine if a security error exists. The error check includes determining if the remote source code file is locked, and determining if an administrator has disallowed an update process. If no security error is detected, the activity data is reconciled with the remote source code file by transmitting the activity data to the server to update the remote source code file. Any conflicts that occur during the reconciliation process are resolved, and after any conflicts have been resolved the modified source code file is uploaded to the server source code control repository.

Claim 21 recites a computer readable storage media storing computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 28. Claim 1 recites a system in which, for example, the method of claim 21 may be performed.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-23 and 25-41 were rejected as being anticipated by Lin. In view of the current amendments and cancellations, however, Applicant respectfully submits that Lin fails to anticipate each limitation of the pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Lin generally discloses a client side caching infrastructure designed to facilitate a seamless operation across connectivity states between client and remote server (see Lin, Abstract, for example). Remote files are cached to a client data store, allowing the client to maintain access to cached files during periods of disconnect (see Lin, Abstract, for example). However, Lin fails to anticipate a system or method for source code control, as claimed. For example, Lin fails to anticipate a client workspace that enables a user to checkout and modify a source code file, as well as a separate file cache for storing the source code file in an unmodified state while the user modifies the checked-out file in the client workspace (see ¶¶ [0024]-[0025] of US 2005/0235012, for example). Lin also fails to anticipate moving the client to an offline mode and executing commands on checked-out a file in the client workspace, storing activity data (including commands executed against the source code file), and reconciling the activity data with a remote source code file, among other claimed limitations (see ¶¶ [0023]-[0027] of US 2005/0235012, for example).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 21 and 28 are not anticipated by Lin. Furthermore, it is noted that Lin does not qualify as a valid prior art reference for an obviousness rejection under §103. In particular, it is noted that Lin qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) and that Lin was, at the time the claimed invention was made, assigned to or subject to assignment to Microsoft Corp, the assignee of the present application. Accordingly, Lin cannot be asserted against the present application in an obviousness rejection according to §103(c).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the rejections to the independent claims are now moot and that the independent claims are now allowable over the cited art, such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; and/or (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:laf:ahy  
2388103\_1.DOC